

## Appendix E

### Responses to Comments

The comments received are summarized below, along with TVA's responses.

- 
- Commenter:** Department of the Air Force Air Education and Training Command  
Russel T. Farringer, III, Acting Chief, Environmental Planning Branch
- Summary of Comment:** The document lacks readability for the general public due to undefined acronyms, numerical inconsistencies (such as the actual height of the process building and the actual acreage required for the project), and certain technical terms found primarily in the sections addressing noise impacts in Chapters 3 and 4.
- Response:** Several acronyms and their definitions were added to the list of acronyms and abbreviations in the preface.

The building height unit designation was changed from stories to feet. The building would be approximately 60 feet tall rather than three or four stories as was previously recorded in the draft EA. Also, we note that the apparent inconsistency in the amount of acreage required for the project is due to the need to purchase approximately six acres (Section 4.3.1.1) while the footprint of the facility, including parking space, would be approximately four acres (Section 2.6 and page B-1).

On page 3-2 and other applicable locations, the term "octave band analysis" has been changed to "frequency analysis." On page 4-3 and other applicable locations, the term "quarter spherical solid angle of propagation" has been changed to "reflection from the ground and electrolyte storage tanks."

- 
- Commentor:** Department of the Air Force Air Education and Training Command  
Russel T. Farringer, III, Acting Chief, Environmental Planning Branch
- Summary of Comment:** The facility's compliance with the United States Air Force Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone (AICUZ) requirements was questioned due to the building height and the power line interface with the substation.
- Response:** Tom Waller, CAFB Utility Engineer, has explained to TVA that compatibility with the requirements in the AICUZ document does not become an issue until structures reach an elevation of 150 feet or more. The vent stack, at a height of 70 feet, would be the tallest structure associated with the Regenesys™ facility. Therefore, this is not an issue and has not been discussed in the document.
-

**Commentor:** Department of the Air Force Air Education and Training Command  
Russel T. Farringer, III, Acting Chief, Environmental Planning Branch

**Summary of Comment:** Section 2.9 identifies the preferred alternative based on the environmental review and on cost/design issues. The strength of the argument presented for selection of Alternative A was questioned due to the lack of information concerning the cost of purchasing this site, relocating the mobile homes there, and the cost difference between Alternative A and B when connecting to the substation is considered.

**Response:** Section 2.9 now simply states the preferred alternative. The information in the paragraph has been moved to the "Finding of No Significant Impact" and has been changed to address these issues.

---

**Commentor:** Department of the Air Force Air Education and Training Command  
Russel T. Farringer, III, Acting Chief, Environmental Planning Branch

**Summary of Comment:** The environmental justice discussion in Section 4.13 was scant. Additional language for consideration in amending the text and a link to a Web site for possible additional demographic information were provided.

**Response:** The discussion in section 4.13 is brief because the area which would be affected by the project does not contain disproportionate low income or minority populations. The Web site was consulted but did not provide additional information beyond the census data which were used to analyze the issue. The text of sections 4.13 and 3.13 has been revised and now incorporates some of the suggested language.

---

**Commentor:** Department of the Air Force Air Education and Training Command  
Russel T. Farringer, III, Acting Chief, Environmental Planning Branch

**Summary of Comment:** If Alternative B were selected, the statutory requirement for coordinating hazardous waste storage on military facilities (10 USC 2692) must be complied with as would the requirement to obtain a real estate permit. These requirements should be mentioned in the document.

**Response:** Section 3.10.1 on page 3-17, Section 4.10.2.1.2 on page 4-32, and Section 1.3 on page 1-3 have been revised to note these requirements:

---

**Commentor:** Department of the Air Force Air Education and Training Command  
Russel T. Farringer, III, Acting Chief, Environmental Planning Branch

**Summary of Comment:** The mobile home park on the site of Alternative A is designated as “AFB Mobile Home Park” in Section 2.4, but is not within the boundaries of the CAFB.

**Response:** The “AFB” portion of this designation has been removed from the sentence under Section 2.4.

---

**Commentor:** Golden Triangle Planning and Development District  
Rupert L. Johnson, Executive Director

**Summary of Comment:** The Proposed project appears to be consistent with the GTPDD District Development Program. Requirements of Executive Order 12372 have been met at the regional level.

**Response:** The Clearinghouse comments are noted.

---

**Commentor:** U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Jackson Field Office  
Kathy W. Lunceford, Acting Field Supervisor

**Summary of Comment:** Information was provided on the ecological resources of Stinson Creek and the Tombigbee River.

**Response:** Sections 3.7.1 “Surface Water,” 3.12.1 “Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology” (existing environment), and 4.12.1 “Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology” (impacts) have been revised to reflect the additional information.

---

**Commentor:** U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Jackson Field Office  
Kathy W. Lunceford, Acting Field Supervisor

**Summary of Comment:** The service is concerned that a major spill of bromine could occur at the facility and affect the resources of Stinson Creek and the Tombigbee River. Even though the likelihood of a major spill would be low, the service requested TVA to develop a formal spill response plan for the project, including measures such as hazing to reduce impacts to waterfowl.

**Response:** Bromine itself would not spill, but the electrolytes could. As was noted in the draft EA, a spill affecting areas outside the facility would be extremely unlikely, but spill response plans would be developed, and various sections of the EA have been revised to note this. The plans would address impacts to waterfowl if feasible. A spill likely to affect waterfowl along Stinson Creek or the Tombigbee River would be large enough that the minimizing effects on people living closer to the facility would probably take priority.

---

**Commentor:** Chickasaw Nation  
Mr. Jefferson Keel, Lieutenant Governor

**Summary of Comment:** The nation is not aware of any culturally sensitive or sacred sites which would be affected.

**Response:** Under "Cultural, Archeological, and Historical Resources," Sections 4.11.1.1 and 4.11.1.2 have been revised to include this comment.

---

**Commentor:** Mississippi Department of Archives and History (State Historic Preservation Officer)  
Mr. Elbert R. Hilliard, Executive Director

**Summary of Comment:** The department concurs with TVAs determination that there would be no effects on cultural resources.

**Response:** Under "Cultural, Archeological, and Historical Resources," Sections 4.11.1.1 and 4.11.1.2 have been revised to include this comment.

---